

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. None

AT&T CORP.
ROOM 2A207
ONE AT&T WAY
BEDMINSTER NJ 07921

SEP 2 2 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :

Wai Sum Lai

Application No. 09/477,365 : DECISION ON PETITION Filed: January 4, 2000 : UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.181

Attorney Docket No. 1999-0492

Title: UPSTREAM BANDWIDTH :

ALLOCATION FOR PACKET TELEPHONY
IN A SHARED-MEDIA PACKETSWITCHED ACCESS NETWORK

This is a decision on the petition filed on August 24, 2006, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.181, requesting that the holding of abandonment in the above-identified application be withdrawn.

The above-identified application became abandoned for failure to submit drawings in a timely manner in reply to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due, mailed March 7, 2006, which set a shortened statutory period for reply of three months. No extensions of time are permitted for transmitting formal drawings<sup>1</sup>. Accordingly, the above-identified application became abandoned on June 8, 2006. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on July 26, 2006.

The present petition was submitted on August 24, 2006. The electronic file has been reviewed, and it is noted that on April 19, 2006, an Examiner's Interview was mailed, indicating that new drawings are not required.

Accordingly, the petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.181(a) is GRANTED.

<sup>1</sup> See MPEP \$710.02(e).

The Office of Patent Publication will be notified of this decision so that the present application can be processed into a patent.

Telephone inquiries regarding this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571)  $272-3225^2$ . All other inquiries concerning examination procedures or status of the application should be directed to the Technology Center.

Paul Shanoski Senior Attorney Office of Petitions

al Manel.

United States Patent and Trademark Office

<sup>2</sup> Petitioner will note that all practice before the Office should be in writing, and the action of the Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. See 37 C.F.R. \$1.2. As such, Petitioner is reminded that no telephone discussion may be controlling or considered authority for Petitioner's further action(s).